



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/825,470	04/15/2004	Charles Joseph Dellis	136845 (553-1143)	8120
45436	7590	03/03/2009		
DEAN D. SMALL THE SMALL PATENT LAW GROUP LLP 225 S. MERAMEC, STE. 725T ST. LOUIS, MO 63105			EXAMINER LAMPRECHT, JOEL	
			ART UNIT 3737	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 03/03/2009	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

Docket@splglaw.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/825,470

Applicant(s)

DELLIS, CHARLES JOSEPH

Examiner

JOEL M. LAMPRECHT

Art Unit

3737

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 November 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 11-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-9, and 11-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogino et al (2002/0029264 A1) in view of Schweikard et al (US 6,501,981). Ogino et al distinctly point out and teach the use of a method and system for processing medical images through configuration of a system and control of access from multiple locations in order to facilitate post-processing operations to assist in diagnosis and treatment of patients (0101 - 0121). The post-processing allowing for specific types of post-processing operations to be performed per-user based on variable permissions via a WAN/LAN/VPN system (0103-0112), including real-time access to uploading and post-processing of medical images, storing recent images on the medical imaging system for quick access (0129-0150), retrieval of post-processed data by the local system for display on the local user interface for diagnosis or evaluation, post-processing operations being controlled by customizable settings (including an automated request and delay of time for processing) for different image types (0130-0154), and finally allowing different end-users to perform post-processing, acquisition, registration, or retrieval based on permissions within the server (0127-0153). The server itself uses multiple processing units to alleviate the processing load on the local

imaging systems (Figure 1-2), which then are only required to upload compressed images (0127-0130) and are not required to perform any of the post-processing operations on their local processor. This procedure is cited as "reducing processing load" (0005-0013) and allowing for continued acquisition of data (0067-0071, 0165-0173)). The system also performs billing and fee structures, and bases securities on individual end-user stations and settings (0117-0121), and provides the capability to perform image processing at a specific time after completion of operations of scanning for a day via a request system (0207-0235).

Regarding claims 1, 8, 10, 15, 24, 30, 33, 34 and 39 Ogino et al do not focus on the local processing (one of the plurality of locations being discussed in the independent claims) of images by the system or the remote control of the imaging system by a user at a different location than the system itself, nor is there a specific reference to ending the scanning for one day and starting the next day. Attention is then directed to the secondary reference by Schweikard et al, which describes a method for remote controlling an imaging system during a radiosurgical procedure. Their particular disclosure provides remote methods for remote motion-control of an imaging system, as well as compensation for motion artifacts via an adaptable marker-based motion detection system (Col 10 Line 55- Col 11 Line 55). Finally, they disclose image processing and display at the system-end (Figure 4, Col 4 Line 64- Col 6 Line 55) It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have utilized the radiosurgery control methods disclosed by Schweikard et al with the post-surgery assessment and remote access data sharing methods of Ogino

et al for the purpose of providing remote access to an imaging system as well as a streamlined platform for reducing post-processing loads on the local system.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 11/26/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding the argument that remote processing operations are not performed using the medical imaging system, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Medical imaging system is involved in post-processing both in a first compression/decompression loop, information send/receive loop and a second compression/decompression loop. All 3 of these constitute part of the post-processing operations on medical image information. While Ogino teaches the remote processing of medical images so as to reduce the load on the processor of the medical imager itself, the system of Ogino includes the networks, remote locations as an integrated system (Fig 16). Additionally and as mentioned above, the post-processing compression/decompression loops are performed as both remote and client-side requests in the loop should compression of the images be required. Therefore Examiner submits that it cannot be argued that none of the post-processing or processing operations are performed locally by remote queues in the Ogino reference as the three examples set forth above constitute post-processing operations.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOEL M. LAMPRECHT whose telephone number is (571)272-3250. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian L. Casler can be reached on (571)272-4956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JML

/BRIAN CASLER/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3737